

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

**REMARKS**

**Present Status of the Application**

Claim 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing the particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6-11 depend on claim 5, which is cancelled already. Therefore, claims 6-11 are indefinite.

Claims 1-4, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori et al. (US 004642182) (hereinafter Drori) in view of Strauss (US 005401404) (hereinafter Strauss). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Uhlenbrock (US006858051B2) and Lavery et. al (US003413778). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss further in view of Sprouse (US002929464). Claims 13-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants submit that independent claim 1 has been amended, claim 18 are newly added, and dependent claims 6-11 have been amended to improve clarity and in accordance with the dependency accordingly changed thereto while the other claims remain unchanged as originally filed. All changes to the claims are fully supported by the originally filed claims, disclosure and the drawings. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 and 6-18 are in proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

**Interview Summary**

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Wu for granting a telephonic interview on June 10, 2007, during which the 35 USC 103(a) rejections by Drori in view of Strauss was discussed. More particularly, the undersigned and Examiner Wu and Examiner Smith discussed that the instant application teaches a disc filter being set up directly on the base and a pipe being set up on top of the disc filter, and if the disc filter 24 of Drori is allegedly disposed on a base, the alleged pipe (44 to 46 in Figure 3A) of Drori is at least configured under the disc filter 24 and not on top of the disc filter 24. The examiners agreed that a recitation of a disc filter being set up directly on the base and a pipe being set up on top of the disc filter in the claims would define over the existing prior art references Drori and Strauss.

**Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112**

The Office Action rejected claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicants have amended claims 6-11. Claims 6-11 are amended to depend on claim 18, which is newly added. Therefore, claims 6-11 are definite.

**Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss. The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Uhlenbrock and Lavery et. al. The Office Action rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Sprouse. The Office Action objected 13-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In response to the rejection thereto, Applicants have amended claim 1, and hereby otherwise traverse this rejection. As such, Applicants submit that the claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4, 6-18 are novel and unobvious over Drori, Strauss, Uhlenbrock, Lavery, Sprouse or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

The features are recited in claim 1. For example, independent claim 1 recited the features.

With respect to claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part:

1. A pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, comprising:

...

a disc filter set up directly on the base and inside the pipe trap body;

a pipe set up inside the pipe trap body with one end linked to the disc filter and the other end linked to the gas outlet, wherein an area on the pipe faces the gas inlet, and the pipe is set up on top of the disc filter;

...

(Emphasis added)

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

Applicants submit that such a pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, as set forth in claims 1, as currently amended, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Drori, Strauss, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Drori does not disclose a disc filter set up directly on the base and a pipe being set up on top of the disc filter. Instead, if the disc filter 24 of Drori is allegedly disposed on a base, the alleged pipe (44 to 46 in Figure 3A) of Drori is at least configured under the disc filter 24 and not on top of the disc filter 24. Drori does not teach or disclose a pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, comprising: "a disc filter set up directly on the base and inside the pipe trap body; and the pipe is set up on top of the disc filter;" as required by the proposed independent claims 1.

Similar to Drori, Strauss also fails to teach or disclose a disc filter set up directly on the base and a pipe being set up on top of the disc filter. Further, although Strauss may have suggested the application of mesh 82, Strauss definitely fails to teach or suggest the plurality of mesh filters being set up inside the pipe. Strauss also does not teach or disclose a pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, comprising: "a disc filter set up directly on the base and inside the pipe trap body; and the pipe is set up on top of the disc filter;" as required by the proposed independent claims 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits Drori and Strauss fail to teach or suggest the limitation of "a disc filter set up directly on the base and inside the pipe trap body; and the pipe is set up on top of the disc filter", and thus the references combined do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1. Therefore, independent claims 1 patently defines over the prior art references, and should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-4, 6-18 patentably define over the prior art as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/709,607

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-4 and 6-18 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

August 7, 2007

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw) ;  
[usa@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:usa@jcipgroup.com.tw)